

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 7, 10-12 and 14 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1-4, 7, 10-12 and 14 can be found in the specification as originally filed, for example, at page 12, lines 1-15; page 14, lines 1-8; page 15, lines 9-18; page 24, lines 1-10; and in claims 1-4, 7, 10-12 and 14 as originally filed. No new matter is added by these amendments.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

A. First Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 7-9 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the rejection, claims 7 and 12 have been amended herein to remove the phrase "having a molecular weight of 3,000 or less." Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 7-9 and 12-14 satisfy the enablement requirement of §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with the rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 10, 11 and 14 have been amended to more clearly set forth the subject matter therein and that claims 1-14 are not indefinite.

In particular, the Office Action first asserts that the definitions of Z and Z' are ambiguous. With respect to Z, the Office Action asserts that the relationship of the bond to alkylene, ester, urethane, amide and ether groups is unclear. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have been amended to clearly indicate that Z is a connecting group, which connects the Y of a cyclic structure to a Y of another cyclic structure of general formula (1),

and is derived from the listed groups. With respect to Z', the Office Action asserts that the definition is confusing because "the alkylene group would seem to be a reactive group."

Applicant respectfully submits that while an alkylene group, which contains a carbon-carbon double bond, may be characterized as a reactive group, it may also be a derivative of another group, as claimed herein. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the terms Z and Z' are not unclear. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims clearly set forth that Z connects at least two cyclic structures of general formula (1) through their respective Ys.

Second, the Office Action asserts that the language concerning the integer m is confusing. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims clearly set forth that m may be the same or different for respective repeating units within each cyclic structure.

Third, the Office Action asserts that the phrase "a total number of the bond represented by Z is 1 or more" is unclear. Applicant respectfully submits that the phrase has been amended to more clearly state that "a total number of connecting groups represented by Z in the cyclic structure is 1 or more."

Fourth, the Office Action asserts that claim 10 is unclear because the final clause reads "subjecting the molten polymer compound to extrusion molding in a prescribed mold," and the term "prescribed mold" is unclear. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 has been amended to remove the allegedly unclear phrase, so that the final clause of claim 10 clearly sets forth "subjecting the molten polymer compound to extrusion molding."

Fifth, the Office Action asserts that the language of the second and last lines of claim 11 is unclear regarding whether the coating composition is applied or whether the coating composition itself is coated. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 has been amended to clearly set forth, in pertinent part, that the coating composition is applied to a substrate.

Finally, the Office Action asserts that the "functional material" of claim 14 lacks antecedent basis in claim 11. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 has been amended

to properly depend from claim 12, which provides antecedent basis for the term "functional material."

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-14 are not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Julie M. Seaman
Registration No. 51,156

JAO:JMS/jms

Date: June 7, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--